Student Growth Workgroup

Educator Effectiveness Project

Minutes

May 8, 2012: Meeting #10

Utah Law and Justice Center

Present: Lynne Baty, Jay Blain, Jen Lambert, David Smith, Aaron Brough, JoEllen Shaeffer, Lori Gardner, Wendy Carver, Cathy Jensen, Sara Jones, Kerrie Naylor, Darryl Thomas, Paul Wagner, John Jesse, Joe Defillipis for Emily Tew, and Scott Marion.

Excused: Linda Alder, Emily Tew, Leah Voorhies, Reed Spencer, Logan Toone, Robert Cox, Laurel Brown, Selena Terry, James Birch, Travis Rawlings, Sydnee Dickson, Brian McGill, Judy Park, Kevin King.

1. Welcome Kerrie (9:00)

- Roll, travel vouchers, etc.
- Review and approve Minutes for Meeting #9 April 17, 2012
- Review Agenda
- Goals for today
 - o Finish discussing the second draft Guidance for Utah's Student Learning Objective process
 - Decide on the recommendation for shared attribution of tested subjects and grades
 - o Discuss the weighting recommendations for Student Growth for the Evaluation System framework

Minutes from Meeting #9 were moved and seconded by Sara Jones and Paul Wagner. The goals for today were reviewed.

2. Student Learning Objectives (SLO) Guidance Proposal #2 DRAFT

Kerrie and Lynne (9:30)

• Discuss SLO draft proposal and complete the discussion of the guidance

This item was moved on the agenda to number 4.

The discussion about the DRAFT Guidance Document for SLOs provided feedback for Scott Marion. The group has discussed this document a lot and Scott has been patient about including the items that the group felt needed to be addressed. Kerrie had the group divide up into 4 teams. Each team took a section of the document and word-smithed it so that they could send their feedback to Scott. Kerrie put the information together and will send it out with the minutes and to Scott and Chris.

Break 10:30 - 10:45

- 3. Continue Draft Discussion (if needed)
- 4. Discuss the feedback from the Table Discussions at the Summit

Lynne and Kerrie (11:00)

This item was moved to #2. Kerrie asked the group to read the feedback silently. The group then began its discussion with the items listed on the last page – "Recommendations or Observations for the Workgroup to Consider." Some of the information below was captured for the minutes:

- Shared SLOs are a "must!"
- How do we capitalize on "shared" SLOs?
- How will the Arts fit in? Ideas included 1. Content Areas work together and create a bank of SLOs; 2. Professional
 organizations will take a role in this; 3. Singleton subjects can be structured by districts to work together on SLOs
 just like they do with PLCs.
- Making sure that the number of SLOs that educators have is high enough is very important because they mitigate
 the possibility of educators being 'hurt" by SLOs

- Concepts associated with sharing or aggregating SLOs: 1. School Improvement Plans; 2. Alignment process in a
 district—like peeling an onion from the outside into the classroom and student; 3. The structure already exists like
 in PLCs; 4. Similar to what teachers and leaders are already doing in collaboration.
- We might have a perception problem because of comparability if SLOs are individualized, are they comparable? If SLOs are about groups of students, are they practical and helpful for student learning? The Workgroup's recommendation may be the student growth measures need to be weighted less
- SLOs are the 'in betweens' of shared and individual
- Is it possible that if we don't have individual goals through SLOs, that we may be sending a message that we don't value NTSG?
- We need to begin with professional development about what SLOs are and how to create them using quality criteria before doing the weightings.

The second page on "Concerns about SLOs" gave the group a lot to discuss. The key focus was "how do we mitigate these concerns?" The Summit discussion information will be attached to the minutes and posted online.

Lunch 12:00 - 12:45

5. Shared Attribution Discussion

Scott (12:45)

- Possible options for determining the student growth score
- Discussion about Tested SGP weights and SLO weights

Scott presented a PPT with information about shared attribution and weighting considerations for SGPs and SLOs. This was a good beginning point for next year's work.

The PPT is attached to the minutes and posted online.

6. Review the Evaluation System Weights and Ratings

Kerrie (2:30)

- System weighting recommendations being discussed
- Ratings for SLOs/ student growth (i.e., clearly not met, partially met, considerably met, fully met, exceeded objective) What does this group recommend?
- Matrix for decision making

Kerrie presented a draft of a Educator Effectiveness Timeline that included all of the components of the project. Specific information about Student Growth was discussed.

7. Future Meetings

It was decided that our next meeting may be in September. If Kerrie and Lynne feel that a summer meeting is needed, she will email everyone. Kerrie and Lynne plan on having a conference call with Scott and Chris on Monday, May 14 to decide scope of work and charges for next school year.

8. Adjourn (3:00)

The group felt that they had accomplished a lot this year and met the charges that were laid out at the beginning of the year.

Kerrie and Lynne thanked the workgroup for their great work and wonderful support.

Lunch will be provided at noon. Thank you for your participation. Minutes will be sent electronically.